Imagineering Tailor-Made Pasts for Nation-Building and Tourism: A Comparative Perspective

NOEL B. SALAZAR

Imagineering, a concept originally developed by the Walt Disney Company, denotes the combination of creative imagination and technological engineering in the 'theming' of goods, services and places, so that visitors develop memorable experiences of their visit (cf. Imagineers 1996). The principal goal of imagineers is to create a successful balance between illusion and reality, and this by engaging all senses and moving peoples' emotions within a fantasy environment in which, paradoxically, the fantasy feels completely real. Disney's innovative methods have been successfully copied across the globe to create attractive (and predominantly leisurely) landscapes. Depending on the theme, the images, imaginaries and representations that are manipulated to construct and enact peoples and places differ. Interestingly, the myths, histories, and fantasies imagineers draw upon to appeal to people's desires and personal imaginations can be either ones associated with the locality at hand or others that are more widely circulating, from the most spectacular fantasies to the most mundane reveries (cf. Salazar 2010).

In the context of developing countries, these imaginaries – unspoken representational systems that are culturally shared and socially transmitted – draw upon colonial and postcolonial visions of Self and Other that circulate through popular culture media, (travel) literature, and academic writings in disciplines such as anthropology, archaeology, and history (cf. Salazar 2008). Since such imaginaries are multi-scalar, themed environment developers can use any number of cultural representations at any scale to present a seemingly cogent image, no matter how inaccurate, that appeals to visitors. In this chapter, I critically analyze the imaginaries at play in culturally themed environments. What happens when historical imaginaries of culture(s) are institutionalized, standardized or commoditized? Across the globe, sanitized versions of historical cultures

are replicated and converted into sellable products. Such imagineering tends to be conservative, a flattening and faking that continues to serve the status quo. I illustrate some of the issues at stake by way of ethnographically grounded case studies from Indonesia and Tanzania, showing how themed environments are cleverly used to (re)produce as well as contest currently dominant imaginaries of postcolonial nations and their inhabitants. The methods I relied upon during the fieldwork include participant observation, semi-structured interviews, and the collection of secondary sources (e.g. promotional brochures and local newspaper clippings). The spatial as well as temporal comparisons serve to highlight that, while the contexts might be different, the processes at work are strikingly similar (cf. Salazar 2007).

Building Modern Postcolonial Nations through Historical Culture Parks

Anderson (1991) has described in great detail how the popularization of cultural heritage plays a pivotal role in the forming of nations as imagined political communities. It is no coincidence that young countries around the world, especially postcolonial ones, have seen in national theme parks a unique vehicle to build their nations. A heritage-themed national park serves to underline the message that the nation's foundation are its people, its different customs and cultures, held together by (often invented) common traditions. As Dahles notes, "[t]hese cultural displays provide [...] nations with the opportunity to come to terms with the rapid transformations brought about by modernization" (2001: 12). By integrating minorities into a coherent visual narrative, a national theme park promotes a sense of both nationalism and modernity. However, in multi-ethnic postcolonial nations such as Indonesia and Tanzania, this process unavoidably involves decisions "as to which cultures to privilege and which to ignore" (Stanley 1998: 59). Because imagineering simplifies peoples and places for easy consumption, themed environments inevitably become sites of struggle and the production of 'unity in diversity' through multicultural displays opens up debates about whose reality (past, present and future) is being represented, promoted, narrated, and for whom. Consolidating the cohesion and the unity of the nation through theme parks clearly comes at a price. The examples below from Indonesia and Tanzania illustrate some of the dynamics at work.

Taman Mini Indonesia Indah

Taman Mini Indonesia Indah (Beautiful Indonesia in Miniature) is a 160-hectare open-air park, situated on the south-eastern edge of Indonesia's capital, Jakarta. The park was conceived by Siti Hartinah, the spouse of General Suharto, after visits to an analogous project in Bangkok, Thailand and to Disneyland, USA in 1971 (cf. Pemberton 1994). It was established in 1972 and officially inaugurated in 1975. Taman Mini is centred around a vast reflecting pond containing small artificial islands that form a large natural map of Indonesia, accessible by pedal boat but best viewed from the cable car or elevated train that pass overhead. The rationale behind the national theme section of the park was to give visitors a glimpse of the diversity of the Indonesian archipelago in a single location, as a symbol of the country's motto of *Bhinekka Tunggal Ika* (Unity in Diversity). From the air, one sees alongside the mini-archipelago 26 massive pavilions – one for each Indonesian province in existence at the time the park was built. These constructions form the heart of the national theme park. The pavilions are dominated by traditional *rumah adat* (customary houses), containing sanitized permanent exhibits of arts and crafts and the customs and lifestyles of the peoples from the province, typically the costumes they might wear at a wedding, the furniture they use in their homes, and their jewellery. Sometimes it is possible to taste local food, browse through tourism brochures, or purchase souvenirs. During the weekends, there are often free traditional dance performances, films, and cultural shows. Indonesians going to Taman Mini to learn about and take pride in the multicultural heritage of their country and in their particular regional roots, far exceed the numbers of foreign tourists.

Anthropologists have, each in their own way, tried to make sense of Taman Mini (cf. Acciaioli 1996; Bruner 2005: 211-230; Errington 1998: 188-227; Hitchcock 1998; Pemberton 1994). Many have focused on how the park represents the past as an integral part of the future, through a present which is continuously rendered as cultural icons of regional tradition and how it serves as a tangible expression of modernization (Anderson 1991: 176-177). Indonesia's New Order government (1965-1998) sought to identify one single cultural type for each province, and to play down the extent and breadth of the actual ethnic diversity they had inherited from the Dutch colonial era. The name of the park is significant too, "as in it the cultures of Indonesia's constituent provinces have been extracted as objects of 'beauty'" (Yamashita 2003: 44). In the political logic of the New Order, a flattening of both time and space, the simulacrum of Taman Mini actually exceeds the real Indonesia because it is less confusing, more ordered, and can be understood and

experienced as a whole. Diversity is represented for the most part as differences between domesticated different-but-same administrative regions rather than between local cultures or societies. Taman Mini thus draws together ethnicity and reinvented locality so that each presupposes the other (cf. Boellstorff 2002). As Adams notes, "all of the regional exhibits display material from the same set of categories (weapons, dances, marriage garments, baskets, etc.), regardless of the relevance of these categories to the local groups in question" (1998: 85). Adherence to this uniform set of groupings conveys the message that in spite of superficial differences, there is inherent commonality between the diverse ethnic groups (cf. Acciaioli 1996). In Boellstorff's words, "after all, what is Taman Mini if not model for a human zoo where ethnolocalities are habitats – cages for culture – and the state a zookeeper?" (2002: 31).

From the very beginning, Taman Mini was envisioned as a twin project of raising national consciousness and developing tourism. Unfortunately, most scholars have focused on the former and neglected the study of the latter. Suharto himself strongly believed that tourism would increase (foreign) revenue, enhance the nation's international status and foster domestic brotherhood. As Adams points out, the fact that Indonesia did not have a Ministry of Tourism, but rather a Ministry of Tourism, Post and Telecommunications, reflected "the premise that tourism is inseparable from communications and, hence, nation-building" (1998: 85). Taman Mini's fate after Suharto's forced resignation in 1998 is symbolic of the wider crisis of the Indonesian national project. Since then, the park has faced declining attendance and general neglect. It is still promoted through school textbooks as the place to learn about all of Indonesia and to master the archipelago's cultural diversity. However, there is invariably a discrepancy between the producers' intentions and audience reception (cf. Salazar 2010). Today, Taman Mini is one of Jakarta's most popular recreational spots, crowded on weekends with families and teenagers from the metropolis' growing middle class. Despite attempts to market the park internationally, overseas visitors have declined sharply.

Bruner (2005: 211-230) looks at alternative ways of interpreting Taman Mini, at how various Indonesian ethnicities operating within an official state-sponsored site impose their own meanings and social practices, appropriate the place, and undermine the official interpretation of the site. What is presented to domestic tourists, especially to those originally from the same province, he argues, is experienced as life, not as representation. An indicative study, conducted in 2005, suggests there is a clear mismatch between what is desired and expected by contemporary visitors and what were the original intentions of the founders of the park (cf. Wulandari 2005). The main motivation to visit is recreational, although two thirds of the visitors expect to learn something about Indonesian art and culture during the course of their visit. Like elsewhere in the world, Indonesian youngsters are actually more interested in modern technology and fashionable products than outdated ethnic traditions. Rather than being worried about the cultural unity of their country, they prefer to dream about the world 'out there' – a theme that is central in Dunia Fantasi (Fantasy World), Jakarta's other major attraction park, with imagineered sections named Europe, America and Africa. Thus Taman Mini versus Dunia Fantasi, or "socialistic nationalism" versus "capitalistic internationalism" (Jones/Shaw 2006: 134).

While the nation-building project seems more and more difficult to realize, the link between Taman Mini and tourism is becoming more pronounced. During the New Order era, inhabitants of the provinces were often notably absent in Taman Mini. After the fall of Suharto in 1998, some provinces started bringing their people in and using the permanent exhibitions and cultural events no longer for the purpose of nation-building but, rather, to promote tourism to their region. Because seven new provinces have been created since 2000, Taman Mini needs some rethinking. The park does seem to have some adaptive capacity as is exemplified by the pavilion of the breakaway former province of East Timor, which has become the Museum of East Timor, a memorial to the period of Indonesian rule. Interestingly, one of the latest projects is the development of a Chinese Museum (Taman Budaya Tionghoa Indonesia), to document the culture and history of the large Chinese diaspora (over seven million people), highlighting their lasting contribution to an ever-developing multi-ethnic nation (cf. Schlehe/Uike-Bormann in this volume).

Kijiji cha Makumbusho

Kijiji cha Makumbusho (Village Museum) is situated on the northwestern outskirts of Tanzania's economic capital, Dar es Salaam. The idea for this open-air museum dates back to the colonial era. Shortly before independence in 1961, the then Curator of Ethnography at the National Museum, a certain Mr. Wylie, envisioned the creation of an open-air exhibition to reflect the rich and diverse traditions of architecture. As a child of his time, he realized that "the increasing popularity of modern housing spelled doom for traditional styles and techniques, of which he hoped to preserve selected examples for both display and research purposes, including in each sample relevant household paraphernalia" (Masao 1993: 57). Mr. Wylie also planned for traditional handicraft activities, to breathe

life into such a themed environment. It took time to convince the postcolonial Museum Board of the value of the salvage proposal, but in 1965 a modest budget was set aside to buy a small plot of land (two hectares) and create the museum (which, certainly when compared to the Indonesian example, looks more like a tiny hamlet than a full-sized village). Like other national theme parks, the Village Museum wants to be a place, as the official website indicates, "where you can see all Tanzania in one day" (Village Museum n.d.).

Similar to the core section of Taman Mini, but much smaller in scale, the centrepiece of the Village Museum is a collection of authentically constructed dwellings, meant to show traditional life in various parts of Tanzania. Thirteen 'traditional' units were built, representing the major varieties of vernacular architecture of mainland Tanzania (a modern, urban unit was added later for the sake of representativeness). As in the Indonesian case, there is an assumed equivalence between peoples and places, although in Tanzania the selection happened not along administrative regions but ethnic groups. The idea is one of a linear relation between ethnicity and architectural style: "Tanzania has more than 123 tribes, each of which builds its own type of house" (Mbughuni 1974: 35). However, due to shortage of funding and space, only the following groups are represented: Zaramo, Rundi, Chagga, Maasai, Haya, Hehe, Fipa, Nyakyusa, Nyamwezi, Gogo, and Ngoni. Each group has a house typical of those found in the home area, and all houses are equipped with typical items and utensils normally used by the respective people – but the museum is devoid of those same people.

Since its inception, the Village Museum has been state-funded and the Tanzania Tourist Corporation (now Tanzania Tourist Board) greatly aided in its establishment. As in Taman Mini, the Village Museum often hosts traditional music – especially *ngoma* (drumming) – and dance performances. Some of the country's most famous wood-workers, coming from the Makonde and Zaramo ethnic groups, have worked under the museum's patronage and displayed their wares on its premises. Occasionally, there have been special festivals centred on live presentations of one particular ethnic group (e.g. the Ethnic Days Festival). During these festivities, there are not only performances, but visitors can also enjoy traditional cuisine. In an attempt to promote Tanzanian cultures and traditions, over 20 ethnic groups have presented their cultures at the Village Museum.

On days without special activities, the absence of people around the houses is striking and gives the place a rather desolate and very artificial feel. In fact, it was always the explicit aim not to exhibit 'exotic' ethnicities. This goes back to President Nyerere, who was of the opinion that "human beings could not be preserved like animals in a zoo" (quoted in Schneider 2006: 114). At the same time, the

first period of independent Tanzania was marked by "a general move to banish and segregate from lived experience 'traditions' that did not fit into an image of modernity" and move them to museums, places "where things rest outside the current of time and life" (Schneider 2006: 114). In the Village Museum one finds, physically taken out of everyday life, traditional housing designs, which the Tanzanian state was actively combating as outdated and to be overcome, not least through its grand project of villagisation (cf. Scott 1998). As Schneider points out, "the 'museumization' of traditions, physically and rhetorically, was an exercise in boundary creation – and a statement that such traditions had no other place in modern life" (2006: 114).

Preserving and maintaining vernacular architecture with extremely scarce resources has led to many financial and administrative challenges (cf. Masao 1993). Major and extensive repairs had to be undertaken on the house units. As concerns interpretation, signposting at, and pathways among the different house displays have been completely redone. Much of this was realized with the help of the Swedish African Museum Program, a network joining museums in Sweden and in African countries. In 1996, the program held a Conference on African Open-Air Museums in the Village Museum, and it also twinned the latter with the Skansen Open-Air Museum in Stockholm. This is a highly symbolic linkage, because Skansen was established in 1891 as the first open-air museum in the world, offering a great model for how the nation as an imagined community can be materialized in very concrete ways. Such global twinning programs reinforce the idea that the construction of national heritage follows globally diffused patterns.

Nowadays, the Village Museum attracts very few visitors. There are the occasional visits by expatriate families living in Tanzania or backpackers who landed in Dar and are waiting to travel elsewhere. International volunteers visit Makumbusho as part of their cultural immersion package. The museum administration is convinced that taking Tanzanian people in the Village Museum back to their cultural heritage enables them to see what was good or useful in their (imagined) past and which is worth incorporating in contemporary life and living (cf. Mwenesi 1998). However, there is only a very rudimentary culture of visiting museums among the Tanzanian public (and most cannot afford to do so). The decision by the managers to allow the use of their premises for traditional performances such as initiation ceremonies and wedding dances, and for organizing events to promote indigenous cuisine and traditional dances, seems to be a successful way to draw in the crowds. Among locals, Makumbusho is particularly popular in the evenings as a place where they can

have *nyama choma* (roasted meat) and beer while enjoying some live music – often Congolese musicians playing Souk.

From Display to Experience, from Village Museums to Tourism Villages

While, to a certain extent, both Taman Mini and the Village Museum still fulfil their role in nation-building, through time this has become less of an urgent preoccupation of the respective governments. What is clear is that neither of the two national theme parks ever brought in the expected foreign tourist dollars. Given the precarious economic situation in both Indonesia and Tanzania, other strategies were developed to reach this second goal. This happened in a rapidly changing national and global context. In the 1990s, helped by the end of the Cold War, the world witnessed the rise of the so-called 'experience economy' (cf. Pine/Gilmore 1999). Imaginaries became a key vehicle in what is now called experience tourism. Instead of promoting places to see – sightseeing – tourism stakeholders across the globe started developing experiential packages, marketed in multi-sensorial languages. Museums and museum-like parks were considered old-fashioned. Instead, otherwise lived spaces were readied for easy tourism consumption. As developing nations such as Indonesia and Tanzania are going through a process of rapid democratization and the central governments have much less grip than before, shrewd entrepreneurs have seized the opportunity to commoditize the nostalgic potential of daily rural (often read as 'primitive') life. The imagineering, i.e. the production of visions, of images and of representations of the villages and their inhabitants, was largely initialized by external actors. The focus on the power of imaginaries in the new economy is also linked to another field, that of storytelling (cf. Löfgren 2003). Not simply showcasing cultural heritage, but being able to narrate it in imaginative ways has become an important asset (cf. Salazar et al. 2009). In what follows, I describe how these general trends took shape in Indonesia and Tanzania.

Desa Wisata

"By Desa Wisata [Tourism Village] we mean a village which offers whole atmosphere of village seen from its socio cultural life, customs, which is potential to be developed into tourism components, such as: attraction, accommodation, food and beverages, and other tourist needs. The development of a tourism village does not mean to alter what already exist, but more of calling forth its potentials which already exist in the village and cannot be separated from the village itself. In general a village one which can be developed into tourism village is a village which has already good conditions in economy, social cultural, physical natural surrounding, non-urban, and possess uniqueness in tradition. [sic]" (Suherman 2001: 105)

The economic crisis of 1997 and the fall of Suharto in 1998 radically changed Indonesia in many aspects. After more than three decades under a centralized (and autocratic) national government, the country embarked on a democratization process that quickly gave rise to regional demands for decentralization of power. In response, the central government decided to implement a new policy, devolving many of its administrative authorities to local officials at the regency and city level. In order to finance their new bureaucratic duties, local administrations needed money. Not surprisingly, many turned to tourism as an easy way to obtain the required funds. Although many *desa wisata* (tourism village) programs were originally launched by the central government (which saw them as fundamental tools of national development), local authorities were quick to appropriate the initiative. In central Java, for example, many tourism villages were launched around the same time in which the policies of regional autonomy became effective. Various villages jumped on the wagon, seeing the concept of a tourism village as an alternative to big-scale tourism developments over which they had virtually no control and from which they benefited little.

There is certainly a growing market for village tourism, especially among international tourists and those Indonesians and expatriates living in big urban centres. Tourism villages invite visitors to see and experience the daily life of the villagers: the cycle of a rice field, the visit to home-industries who produce local food and medicine, and craftsmen who make souvenirs. By rethinking what counts as cultural heritage to include the everyday, the alternative and that which has not yet been memorialized in guidebooks and official histories, another kind of Indonesian experience becomes available to the visitor (cf. Salazar 2005). Different villages have different grades of tourism involvement, depending largely on physical and non-physical characteristics of the respective villages and their proximity to other tourism attractions. Some offer a homestay experience, others are only places to stop over and have lunch. Below, I briefly discuss some of the old and new ways in which various stakeholders have tried to implement the concept of tourism-themed villages in central Java. Although the intentions are different, the examples show that the work of cultural preservationists and the interests of government and private entrepreneurs clearly overlap in the development of tourism villages.

On World Tourism Day in 1999, the then Minister of Tourism, Arts and Culture, Marzuki Usman, inaugurated Tembi (Bantul Regency, south of Yogyakarta) as a model of *desa wisata* (cf. The Jakarta Post 1999). Over the years, this project has received many national and international awards for sustainable tourism. The man behind the top-down tourism development in Tembi was an Australian entrepreneur who had chosen the picturesque village as the base of his lucrative export business of high-end handcrafted products (cf. James 2003). His renovation of some of the village houses in Dutch colonial style had fascinated many of his visiting expatriate friends and this is how the idea developed to let (affluent) visitors stay overnight. During the day, the guests could relax around the swimming pool, enjoy the local food, visit the nearby school for dancing and gamelan, pass by the craft workshop, and buy souvenirs at the gallery. To guarantee an 'authentic' view for the guests, the businessman bought the rice paddies surrounding his houses. Word-of-mouth led to a rapid increase in visitors and, after a couple of years, the Australian eventually decided to make his model house private again, thereby halting virtually all tourism development.

Tanjung (Sleman Regency, north of Yogyakarta) is often mentioned by the Indonesian authorities as a 'best practice' tourism village (cf. Ardika 2006). Like its neighbours, Tanjung was a poor farming village, rice cultivation being the major source of income. National government officials introduced the idea of village tourism to local authorities and villagers in 1999 and, in 2001, the villagers officially declared their village as a *desa wisata*. In 2003, representatives of the village signed a Village Tourism Charter and formed an official committee to oversee tourism development. The principal target market is (school) groups from larger cities (cf. Janarto 2006). Tanjung offers almost 25 programs to learn cultural activities such as dancing, making traditional textiles, knowing more about Javanese architecture, or learning how to cultivate rice. These programs are not only recreational in nature but also facilitate the acquisition of knowledge and the experience of new skills. Young villagers are usually the ones guiding visitors around and narrating the stories of the village (often without much training to do so). Interestingly, they usually present the quickly modernizing village life as time-frozen and pre-modern (cf. Salazar 2005).

A local NGO selected Candirejo (Magelang Regency, north of Yogyakarta), near the heavily visited monument of Borobudur, as one of ten villages in which to develop so-called community-based tourism. The village was selected for its original architecture and traditional daily life, beautiful rural scenery and natural resources – all things deemed worthy to be preserved. Financially supported by the Japan International Cooperation Agency and UNDP, and with

expertise provided by UNESCO, Candirejo village was prepared to receive international tourists. In 2003, it was officially inaugurated as *desa wisata* by I Gde Ardika, the then Minister of Tourism and Culture. Given its proximity to a World Heritage Site, Candirejo has attracted far more international tourists than domestic visitors. It is noteworthy that the Minister chose Sambi, another village selected by the same local NGO, to announce the start of Indonesia Heritage Year in 2003 (cf. Wahyuni 2003). In both instances, the representational emphasis is clearly more on the (imagined) pre-modern past than on the present or the future.

Cultural Tourism Program

"Cultural tourism is a people tourism that enables tourists to experience authentic cultures combining nature, scenery, folklore, ceremonies, dances, rituals, tales, art, handicrafts and hospitality - giving a unique insight into the way of life of the people while offering a complementary product to wildlife and beach based tourism." (TTB 2007: 2)

The Cultural Tourism Program (CTP) in Tanzania was launched in 1995 by a Dutch aid agency. In co-operation with projects already started by German and Finnish aid agencies, CTP was set up as a network of local communities, mainly Maasai in northern Tanzania, operating independently from each other and offering individually developed tour packages. These include campsites, homestays, traditional food and beverages, trained guides, and local tours involving natural heritage (forests, waterfalls, and caves) and cultural attractions (historical sites and visits to healers, story tellers, craftsmen, and cooking mamas). The main activities on offer are hiking, learning about local culture and customs, mountain climbing, cycling, canoeing, and fishing. The name CTP refers to the involvement of local people in organizing the tours and in guiding tourists through the attractions while showing them the aspects of their daily life, culture, and history. The Dutch agency financed the various CTP modules, controlled their expenditures, and organized some minimal training for local tour guides. The Tanzania Tourist Board (TTB), on the other hand, is responsible for promoting CTP to both local and international travel agencies and tour operators (cf. De Jong 1999).

Helped by the fact that experiential 'meet the people' tourism was increasingly in vogue, CTP experienced a great boom in its first years of existence. The modules are visited by both tour operators and independent low budget tourists. Because the organizing Dutch agency published widely about the success of CTP, the project was nominated for various international awards. In 2002, the International Year of Ecotourism, CTP was heralded as Tanzania's good

practice example of sustainable development by the World Tourism Organization (WTO 2002: 237-240). The modules are also widely praised in guidebooks such as the *Lonely Planet* or *The Rough Guide*. Due to its perceived economic and institutional sustainability (and because it had been conceived as a five-year project from the very start), the Dutch withdrew from the project in 2001. Since then, there has been a declining cooperation between the different communities involved (cf. van der Duim et al. 2005). Currently, CTP has 26 participating communities and many villages are waiting to join. The examples below illustrate the challenges involved in representing ethnic diversity through village tourism.

As mentioned before, the Maasai are CTP's main 'attraction'. Due to countless coffee-table books, movies and snapshots, everybody seems to know this widely dispersed group of semi-nomadic pastoralists and small-scale subsistence agriculturists (cf. Salazar 2009). To foreign tourists, the sight of a virile Maasai warrior, dressed in colourful red blankets and beaded jewellery, evokes the romantic image of a modern noble savage. Capitalizing on this, quite a number of cultural tours to Arusha villages are marketed and sold as visits to Maasai *bomas* (settlements), while the villages are, at best, ethnically mixed. In Il'kidinga, a village of Arusha people (who are influenced by Maasai ancestry but who abandoned livestock herding in favour of settled cultivation), villagers benefit from the perceived similarities with the Maasai to attract more tourists. For example, they hang out red blankets as a recognizable visual marker of 'Maasai-ness'. Some of the youngsters who guide visitors around the area will 'play' the Maasai, albeit with varying success.

Tourists visiting the CTP of Mkuru do get to see 'real' Maasai, but the local guides accompanying them are often Meru (farmers, traditionally settled around the base of Mt. Meru). Their knowledge about Maasai cultural heritage and customs can be very limited. This often creates friction because bringing foreigners to a Maasai *boma* looks like a visit to a human zoo: Maasai and tourists staring at one another, without a cultural broker to facilitate communication and exchange between the two parties (cf. Salazar 2006). The Maasai visited have no clue about how they are being represented (as primitive) by the Meru guides because they do not understand English. Because tourists do not understand Swahili, they seldom notice that their 'local' guide is not a Maasai but a Meru. Of course, they also do not know that there are growing tensions between Meru and Maasai people in the area because the land they share around Mt. Meru is becoming overcrowded and overstocked.

During CTP tours in Tengeru, the local Meru guides clearly distinguish their ethnic group from the Maasai, for example by never dressing in red but often in blue (although this colour is not particularly associated with the Meru). The guides explain to foreign tourists that only the Maasai wear blankets; the Meru wear clothes. They are proud to say that the Meru are more developed compared to other 'tribes' because they have adapted faster to modernity, and that the Maasai are certainly more primitive. Not only the Maasai have suffered from stereotyping and misrepresentation (some caused by their own people). Other CTP modules in the region illustrate how complex the politics of cultural representation in village tourism can be (cf. Salazar 2010).

Conclusion

"The so-called 'museum' or 'culture park' view of heritage as something that has only to be preserved and tended, only to be kept pristine, isolated from the alterations going on all around it, is not only utopian, it is mischievous. In trying to freeze a living tradition in the name of authenticity you produce the worst sorts of inauthenticity - decadence, not purity." (Geertz 1997: 19)

Bruner notes that themed environments "are an excellent setting for anthropological inquiry as they are sites where the ethnic diversity of the nation or the region is represented for the visitors in a single locality in one panoptic sweep" (2005: 211). In this chapter, I have described how various time periods have given rise to different tailor-made types of themed environments in Indonesia and Tanzania. Taman Mini and the Village Museum were built in the 1970s to develop a feeling of national unity and nationalism in young postcolonial states, though they were clearly inspired by earlier Western projects (as varied as Disneyland in the USA and Skansen in Sweden). To a certain extent, these hybrid open-air museums/theme parks were an attempt to make sense of the multi-ethnic reality with which colonialism had left these countries after independence. Selected aspects of diversity were exhibited, without really attempting to (re)present all ethnicities. Paradoxically, these nationally themed environments visually display difference yet promote unity. Typical house types (reconstructions) are a dominant feature, along with ethnic costumes, aspects of indigenous arts and culture, dance performances, and, in some cases, regional food. While such national theme parks are recreational, they are also seriously political. They symbolize, in a modern way, centralized power (cf. Anderson 1991). Cultural heterogeneity is put in its place – fixed, aligned, domesticated – and turned into recreational exhibition (Bruner 2005: 212). Aimed at a multiplicity of audiences, such themed environments have been mainly successful in attracting domestic crowds.

The tourismification of actual villages in Indonesia and Tanzania, on the other hand, is a more recent development, both a consequence of the recent decentralization of power and a response to the increasing international demand for experiential tourism, often based on the temporal 'Othering' of those living in rural areas (cf. Fabian 2002). The theming of otherwise lived environments strategically makes use of three recurring imaginaries in the tourism of developing countries: the myth of the unchanged, the myth of the unrestrained and the myth of the uncivilized (cf. Echtner/Prasad 2003). A visit to the countryside is told and sold (often by the villagers themselves) as an exotic journey to the past, drawing on widely distributed imaginaries of Orientalism, colonialism, and imperialism, to feed romantic and nostalgic tourist dreams (cf. Salazar 2010).

Whereas ethnography reduces living peoples to writing and museums usually reduce them to artefacts, both national theme parks and tourism villages continue the late 19th and early 20th century tradition of world fairs in that the objects on exhibit include real people. In both themed environments, peoples are presented as unique, separate, and fixed, and this, ironically, is happening at the same time that the world is moving toward mobile subjects, border crossings, and vast population movements (cf. Bruner 2005: 212). Tailor-made imagineering for tourist audiences is well worth more in-depth ethnographic study, because its practices not only create an image of places and peoples, additionally the imaginative power of shrewd imagineers is stealing people's own imaginations in and through invented experiences. The central role of imaginaries as a force of tourism production and consumption of cultural heritage calls for an urgent return to empirical studies of widely circulating dreams and popular flights of fantasy in the context of tourism and beyond.

References

Acciaioli, Gregory. 1996. "Pavilions and Posters: Showcasing Diversity and Development in Contemporary Indonesia." *Eikon* 1: 27-42.

Adams, Kathleen. 1998. "Domestic Tourism and Nation-building in South Sulawesi." *Indonesia and the Malay World* 26.75: 77-96.

Anderson, Benedict R. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* Second ed. New York: Verso.

Ardika, I Gde. 2006. *The Development of Interior Tourism and the Reduction of Poverty: The Case of Java, Indonesia.* Paper presented at the International Conference about Tourism and Reduction of Poverty: Methodology and Good Practices, Toulouse, France.

Boellstorff, Tom. 2002. "Ethnolocality." *Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology* 3.1: 24-48.

Bruner, Edward M. 2005. *Culture on Tour: Ethnographies of Travel.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dahles, Heidi. 2001. *Tourism, Heritage and National Culture in Java: Dilemmas of a Local Community.* Richmond: Curzon Press.

De Jong, Ate. 1999. *Cultural Tourism in Tanzania: Experiences of a Tourism Development Project.* The Hague: Stichting Nederlandse Vrijwilligers.

Echtner, Charlotte M./Pushkala Prasad. 2003. "The Context of Third World Tourism Marketing." *Annals of Tourism Research* 30.3: 660-682.

Errington, Shelly. 1998. *The Death of Authentic Primitive Art and Other Tales of Progress.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fabian, Johannes. 2002. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object.* Second ed. New York: Columbia University Press.

Geertz, Clifford. 1997. "Cultural Tourism: Tradition, Identity and Heritage Construction." *Tourism and Heritage Management.* Ed. Wiendu Nuryanti. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press. 14-24.

Hitchcock, Michael. 1998. "Tourism, Taman Mini, and National Identity." *Indonesia and the Malay World* 26.75: 124-135.

Imagineers. 1996. *Walt Disney Imagineering: A Behind the Dreams Look at Making the Magic Real.* New York: Hyperion.

James, Jamie. 2003. "Lord of the Village: An Aussie Entrepreneur finds Utopia in the Indonesian Countryside." *Time Magazine* 14 July.

Janarto, Daru K. 2006. "Learning from Humble Villagers." *The Jakarta Post* July 16.

Jones, Roy/Brian J. Shaw. 2006. "Palimpsests of Progress: Erasing the Past and Rewriting the Future in Developing Societies." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 12.2: 122-138.

Löfgren, Orvar. 2003. "The New Economy: A Cultural History." *Global Networks* 3.3: 239-254.

Masao, Fidelis T. 1993. "Reviving the Village Museum in Dar es Salaam." *Museum International* 45.1: 57-59.

Mbughuni, L. A. 1974. *The Cultural Policy of the United Republic of Tanzania.* Paris: UNESCO Press.

Mwenesi, Leonard C. 1998. *How Is Art and Art Education Relevant for the Construction of a Tanzanian National Cultural Identity Within the Context of a Hegemonic Globalism?* Department of Secondary Education, University of Alberta.

Pemberton, John 1994. "Recollections from 'Beautiful Indonesia' (Somewhere Beyond the Postmodern)." *Public Culture* 6.2: 241-262.

Pine, B. Joseph/James H. Gilmore. 1999. *The Experience Economy: Work is Theatre & Every Business a Stage*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Salazar, Noel B. 2005. "Tourism and Glocalization: 'Local' Tour Guiding." *Annals of Tourism Research* 32.3: 628-646.

Salazar, Noel B. 2006. "Touristifying Tanzania: Global Discourse, Local Guides." *Annals of Tourism Research* 33.3: 833-852.

Salazar, Noel B. 2007. "Towards a Global Culture of Heritage Interpretation? Evidence from Indonesia and Tanzania." *Tourism Recreation Research* 32.3: 23-30.

Salazar, Noel B. 2008. "Representation in Postcolonial Analysis." *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. Second ed. Ed. William A. Darity. Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA. 172-173.

Salazar, Noel B. 2009. "Imaged or Imagined? Cultural Representations and the 'Tourismification' of Peoples and Places." *Cahiers d'Études Africaines* 193-194: 49-71.

Salazar, Noel B. 2010. *Envisioning Eden: Mobilizing Imaginaries in Tourism and Beyond*. Oxford: Berghahn.

Salazar, Noel B./Jeroen Bryon/Elvira Van Den Branden. 2009. *Cultural Tourism Storytelling in 'Flanders': The Story Behind the Stories*. Leuven: Steunpunt Toerisme.

Schneider, Leander 2006. "The Maasai's New Clothes: A Developmentalist Modernity and Its Exclusions." *Africa Today* 53.1: 101-131.

Scott, James C. 1998. "Compulsory Villagization in Tanzania: Aesthetics and Miniaturization." *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. Ed. James C. Scott. New Haven: Yale University Press. 223-261.

Stanley, Nick 1998. *Being Ourselves for You: The Global Display of Cultures*. London: Middlesex University Press.

Suherman, Ahmad. 2001. *Tourism Village: A Conceptual Approach (Case of Indonesia)*. Paper presented at the Cultural Heritage, Man and Tourism Seminar, Hanoi, Vietnam, 5-7 Nov 2001.

The Jakarta Post. 1999. "Tourism Village Inaugurated." *The Jakarta Post* 29 Sep 1999.

TTB. 2007. *Tanzania Cultural Tourism*. Dar es Salaam: Tanzania Tourist Board.

Van der Duim, René/Karen Peters/Stephen Wearing. 2005. "Planning Host and Guest Interactions: Moving Beyond the Empty Meeting Ground in African Encounters." *Current Issues in Tourism* 8.4: 286-305.

Village Museum. n.d. "The Village Museum Dar es Salaam Tanzania." http://villagemuseum.homestead.com/ (accessed 2 Apr 2010).

Wahyuni, Sri. 2003. "Sambi, a Unique Heritage Village." *The Jakarta Post* 2 June.

WTO. 2002. *Sustainable Development of Ecotourism: A Compilation of Good Practices*. Madrid: World Tourism Organization.

Wulandari, Anak Agung Ayu. 2005. *Taman Mini Indonesia Indah: Entertainment or Education?* International Institute for Culture, Tourism and Development, London Metropolitan University.

Yamashita, Shinji. 2003. *Bali and Beyond: Explorations in the Anthropology of Tourism* [Jerry S. Eades, transl.]. New York: Berghahn.